

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 are amended. Support for the amendments is found at, for example, Fig. 1, Fig. 2 and paragraph [0063]. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Japanese Laid-Open Patent JP06-027899 (Yamazaki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,342,881 (Inoue). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, Yamazaki and Inoue, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the input signal being a signal generated at the electrode biased to a predetermined level that is higher or lower than an input threshold voltage of the inversion logic circuit depending on a polarity of a datum to display, as recited in claim 1.

Yamazaki only discloses that the noise signal sensed by the voltage detection electrode YD is routed to a differential amplifier input 531 via switches 133 and 135, and is compared with the reference voltage V1 or V5 depending on a polarity of data FR, as can be seen in Fig. 5 of Yamazaki.

In contrast, in the present application, a signal generated at the electrode is compared with the input threshold voltage of an inversion logic circuit, and the electrode is biased to a predetermined level that is higher or lower than the input threshold voltage of the inversion logic circuit depending on a polarity of a datum to display.

Yamazaki teaches to compare the signal with a switched reference voltage as opposed to comparing a switched-biased signal with an inherent fixed threshold voltage of the invention logic circuit. Thus, Yamazaki does not disclose or suggest that the electrode is biased to a predetermined level that is higher or lower than the input threshold voltage of the

inversion logic circuit depending on a polarity of a datum to display.

Inoue only discloses a pixel drive method for a pulse-width modulated data line, and does not cure the deficiency of Yamazaki.

For the above reason, claim 1 is patentable over Yamazaki and Inoue.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 recite a similar feature to those referred to in connection with claim 1 above and are therefore patentable over Yamazaki and Inoue.

Claims 4 and 7-11 depend from one of claims 1, 2, 5 and 6. Thus, claims 4 and 7-11 are patentable over Yamazaki and Inoue for at least the same reason as claim 1, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Aaron L. Webb
Registration No. 56,930

JAO:HXT/axl

Date: January 11, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--